

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-15 are pending and under consideration.

GROUNDS FOR ENTRY OF THIS RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. 1.116

The Applicants respectfully request entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1, 7, 10, 12 and 14 puts these claims into condition for allowance. These amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda (US 6,107,771) (hereinafter “Maeda”).

Amended claim 1 recites: “...wherein the correction data are predetermined by performing a learning control based on position deviations for predetermined periods in repeatedly driving a driven member in a predetermined region by the servomotor.” Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 2 and 3. In contrast to claim 1, Maeda discusses a servo control system has a learning controller in the control system. In claim 1, the velocity command is corrected using the correction data predetermined based on the learning control.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 3, 4 and 6 are dependent on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 102

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seoung et al. (US 5,666,034) (hereinafter “Seoung”) or Seong et al. (US 5,773,938) (hereinafter “Seong”).

Amended claim 10 recites: "...wherein the correction data are predetermined using learning control based on position deviations for predetermined periods in repeatedly driving a driven member in a predetermined region by the servomotor." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 11 and 12. In contrast to claim 10, both Seoung and Seong discuss a servo control system having a learning controller in the control system. In claim 10, the torque command is corrected using the correction data predetermined based on the learning control.

Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 13 and 15 are dependent on claim 10 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda (US 6,107,771) in view of Ishikawa (US 5,907,450).

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above. Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 7-9, 12 and 14 have been found to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 7, 12 and 14 have been rewritten in independent form. It is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 9 are allowable in their present form.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Feb 17, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501